

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed May 18, 2003. Claims 1 – 19 were pending in the present application. Claims 1 – 19 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pogue (PalmPilot: The Ultimate Guide, hereinafter “Pogue”).

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that “a container object is an object that contains/holds objects such as item data objects.” However, Applicant’s claim 1 further recites **“wherein the list container object is executable to specify a corresponding list item data object for each of a plurality of list item renderer objects.”** Applicant therefore disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that “According to the language of the claims, the list container object could be interpreted as a directory that contains child objects or item data objects.” A directory, as is commonly understood in the art, is a data structure, and as such is not executable.

Likewise, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that “each item data object has a corresponding renderer object, which could be interpretable as internal data that is associated with an item data object, and being used for the system to render/display the item data object.” Internal data is not executable, and as such cannot be characterized as a **“list item renderer object” “executable to display the list item data object in the display device of the small footprint device,”** as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, even if, *arguendo*, the “internal data” is assumed to be associated with an item data object and used to render/display the item data object, Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Pogue wherein such action is taken **“in response to said list container object specifying a corresponding list item data object for each list item renderer object,”** as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly claim 1, along with its dependent claims 1 – 6, is believed to patentably distinguish over Pogue. Claims 7 and 13 recite features similar to those of

claim 1. Accordingly claims 7 and 13, along with their dependent claims 8 – 12 and 14 – 19 are believed to patentably distinguish over Pogue for at least the reasons given above.

Likewise, claim 2 recites “**wherein the list container object is executable to instantiate the plurality of list item renderer objects.**” As described above, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s characterization of a directory as a list container object. Accordingly, Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Pogue of the above limitation, and believes claim 2 to patentably distinguish over the cited art. Claims 8, 14, and 19 recite similar limitations, and are thus likewise believed to patentably distinguish over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

No fees are believed necessary; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-1505\5181-53800\BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 8-3-04